



EAST
CAMBRIDGESHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM NO 4

MEETING OF THE ELY MASTERPLAN/GROWTH DELIVERY WORKING PARTY

Notes of a meeting held in the Council Chamber,
The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely on Thursday
15 June 2009 at 7.30pm

PRESENT

Councillor Peter Moakes (Chairman)
Councillor Brian Ashton, Co-opted Member, City of Ely Council
Councillor Sheila Friend-Smith
Councillor Bill Hunt – Co-opted Member, Cambridgeshire
County Council
Councillor Mike Rouse

OFFICERS

Shirley Blake – Principal Sustainable Development Officer
Ann Caffall – Infrastructure and Project Officer
Giles Hughes – Head of Planning and Sustainable Development
Melanie Stimpson – Democratic Services Officer

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor Ian Allen
Councillor Anna Bailey (entered the meeting at minute no. 8, during the
presentation by ATKINS)
Councillor Tony Cornell
Councillor Tony Goodge
Councillor Tony Parramint
Councillor Jackie Petts
Councillor Gareth Wilson

Michael Addyman, ATKINS
Caroline Cannon, ATKINS
James Lindsay, ATKINS
Jeremy Smith, Transport Strategy Manager, Cambridgeshire County
Council

9 members of the public attended the meeting.

1. **ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

Councillor Peter Moakes was proposed and duly seconded. There being
no other nominations

It was resolved:

That Councillor Peter Moakes be elected as Chairman of the Ely Masterplan/Growth Delivery Working Party for the ensuing Municipal year.

2. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

One question was submitted by Mrs Gillian Tuberfield, as follows:

'When and where was this meeting, with its invitation to the public to attend notified and publicised? I was only notified of the meeting by a telephone call from Shirley Blake's assistant at 5.15pm on Friday 12 June 2009 (I had written to Shirley Blake on 24 March, 2 June and 10 June and have missed another meeting to be present this evening).'

I have been asking regularly at the Council reception for access to the minutes of the Masterplan meetings. These should be available for at least one year, either in the Council and/or the library.

I was given a copy of the minutes of 2 April 2009 overstamped 'draft minutes' in the first week of June. No date of the next meeting (this one) is shown at the end of the minutes. Several meetings of the Working Party have been cancelled in the last couple of months – I have discovered by asking regularly.

It is not satisfactory only to notify meetings on the website. Too many residents (and we as ratepayers are all 'stakeholders') do not have access. Please also use the local press.'

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that the Working Party meetings were advertised in the same way as all other Council meetings. Council meetings were not advertised in the press, as was the practice for public consultation exercises. The Working Party meetings were open to the public to attend. Notes for these meetings were produced and then posted to the Council's website.¹

3. **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence received from the Working Party. However, an apology for absence was received from John Onslow of Cambridgeshire Horizons.

¹ Since the Working Party meeting the Infrastructure and Project Officer arranged for Mrs Tuberfield to visit the Council Offices to demonstrate how to access the agendas and minutes via the Council's website.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Ashton declared a personal interest in agenda item 8 – Ely Masterplan – Issues for Consideration. Cllr Ashton drew Members attention to the sixth map titled ‘Ely at Home’ in Appendix 2 of the report, specifically to the darker brown shaded area of the map identified by the key as ‘Redevelopment of Lisle Lane/existing waste water treatment site for residential use’. Cllr Ashton explained that the personal interest related to a fully developed site of one acre, set within approximately eight acres of commercial development, which formed part of the overall location of about fifteen acres. His site interest was let on a commercial lease to a national firm of builders’ merchants until 2025 at which point they had a legal entitlement to renew the lease. The Council also owned two acres of land within the balance of the location. Cllr Ashton further explained that if the Working Party were to consider a change of use to his property and/or the adjacent commercial properties, then he would declare a prejudicial interest and leave the meeting.

Cllr Hunt declared a personal interest, as in addition to owning his own personal residence in Ely he also owned a 50% share of two properties in Ely, one in Silver Street and the other in New Barns Road.

5. **ELY MASTERPLAN/GROWTH DELIVERY WORKING PARTY NOTES**

It was agreed:

The notes of the Ely Masterplan/Growth Delivery Working Party meeting held on 2 April 2009 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

6. **CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman informed the Working Party that there had been a change of membership relating to the co-opted Membership of the Working Party. The Chairman welcomed Cllr Ashton to the meeting as the co-opted Member representing the City of Ely Council, as the replacement for Cllr Hobbs.

7. **ELY MASTERPLAN/GROWTH DELIVERY WORKING PARTY – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Working Party was presented with its Terms of Reference, for noting, which had been amended by Strategic Development Committee on 21 April 2009.

The Chairman explained that the amendments had been to extend the timescale to enable the Working Party to continue until April 2010 and to accurately reflect the membership in 1.3 of the Terms of Reference.

Cllr Hunt referred to 2.2 of the Terms of Reference and that to achieve this objective the ideal situation would be to utilise the Neighbourhood Panels across the district and to involve the Panels in the process.

Cllr Friend-Smith agreed that all villages that impacted on Ely should be included in the Masterplan process, including the City of Ely Council, and be offered the opportunity to offer feedback.

Cllr Ashton noted that three Neighbourhood Panel meeting dates had been included in the Ely Masterplan Work Programme between 26 – 28 October 2009. Cllr Ashton requested that general update information be provided to the Neighbourhood Panels earlier in the process and that an information session be organised for the City of Ely Council.

Cllr Hunt agreed that the City of Ely Council should be consulted. However the Neighbourhood Panels and the surrounding villages should also be included and suggested that a set radius surrounding Ely should be established for the villages to be consulted.

It was agreed:

That the updated Ely Masterplan/Growth Delivery Working Party Terms of Reference be noted.

8. **ELY MASTERPLAN – ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer explained that the Working Party would receive four presentations on the following, copies of which were available by contacting Economic Development Section.

- Presentation 1 - Background and context
- Presentation 2 - Transport issues
- Presentation 3 - Strategic Growth Issues
- Presentation 4 - Development Opportunity sites

The first presentation that the Working Party received was from the Principal Sustainable Development Officer on the Background and Context of the Ely Masterplan. In addition to the presentation, the Principal Sustainable Development Officer elaborated that:

- The two quotes contained within the presentation, which had been used to inspire the work of the Masterplan, had been obtained from 'Local Futures - Business Stability and Place Sustainability'.
- The Masterplan was not intended to be a detailed document or a site allocations document. It would detail the long-term vision for the Ely area via supplementary planning document status.

The second presentation that the Working Party received was from Caroline Cannon of ATKINS. In addition to the presentation Ms Cannon explained that:

- The presentation outlined the modelling work that had been undertaken and was divided into four sections. The first section

provided a background to the study and explained the model development. The second section presented the Land Use Option Testing Methodology and results from this work. The third section provided a review of an Ely Southern Bypass. The final section explained the work undertaken to identify and test a package of transport measures in Ely.

Background and Model Development

- A highway traffic model had been developed using the SATURN software to reflect weekday AM peak and PM peak traffic conditions. The model had been developed using recent data, which had mainly been collected during autumn 2008 specifically for the study. Data had also been used from the East of England Regional Model to ensure that strategic flows were comparable.
- The extent of the model covered the centre of Ely in the greatest detail. However reached Littleport to the north, Soham and Stretham to the south and Witchford to the west. Not every road was included in the network. However the A10, A142 and the local roads in the centre of Ely were included in the network.
- The 2008 base models had been used to develop a forecast year 'Reference Case' which was a forecast of what the traffic in and around Ely would be in the year 2031. The additional traffic in the Reference Case had been estimated by mode for the different land use types based on recognised and local growth factors.
- The 2031 Reference Case Model Network illustrated a new Northern Link Road connecting Kings Avenue to the B1382 Ely Road/Prickwillow Road roundabout and level crossing closure time increased from the current 20 minutes per hour to 30 minutes per hour to accommodate the Network Rail plans for freight improvements. It had been suggested that by 2031 the level crossing on the A142 Station Road was expected to be closed for as much as 50 minutes per hour. However it was unclear whether or not this increased closure time would affect peak hours. Therefore forecast tests were based on an estimated 30 minutes closure time.
- The Reference Case Scenario map highlighted housing development (shaded blue) east of the Princess of Wales hospital and Lisle Lane, convenience and comparison retail development (shaded green) on Lisle Lane and the Paradise Leisure Centre site and employment development (shaded red) on Lancaster Way and Angel Drove. All of which remained constant in all land tests.

Land Use Option Testing Methodology and results

- The initial purpose of developing the traffic model and the 2031 Reference Case was to provide a platform on which to test future land use proposals and to accommodate proposed growth in Ely. The 3 land use scenarios (Local Development Framework Growth, Central Growth and Trend Growth) were developed on the varying levels of growth that was proposed for the north of Ely. The Local Development

Framework (LDF) had growth rates based on existing Regional Spatial Strategy requirements. The Central growth scenario was based on growth rates half way between the LDF and Trend scenarios. The Trend growth scenario had growth rates based on the level of growth experienced between 2001 – 2007.

- All three growth scenarios included 250 dwellings east of the Princess of Wales hospital allocated in the Core Strategy. In addition further dwellings had been allocated to bring the total dwellings to approximately the following, which were located in the eastern part of the Northern Expansion site:
 - 1000 dwellings - LDF growth scenario
 - 3000 dwellings – Central growth scenario
 - 5000 dwellings – Trend growth scenario
- Initial tests had indicated that the growth in the Central and Trend scenarios would require additional access linkages through the Northern Expansion site connecting to the A10, Cam Drive and the B1382 Prickwillow Road.
- Simply comparing the 2008 Base Reference Case with the 2031 Reference case indicated a significant increase in traffic, even without the additional growth anticipated in the Core Strategy, which will have a large impact on the network.
- The diagram included in the ‘Reference Case Results – AM Peak Hour’ slide demonstrated delay and capacity on roads and junctions. Green indicated no delay and junctions within capacity; yellow indicated some delay or junctions nearing capacity and red indicated delays and where junctions exceeded capacity. There was an increase in traffic flow on most roads and significant delays at the A10/Witchford Road roundabout mainly due to the expansion of the Lancaster Way Business Park.
- Once the 2008 Base Reference Case had been compared to the 2031 Reference Case all further growth scenarios were compared to the 2031 Reference Case. The LDF Growth Scenario - AM Peak Hour resulted in a further 360 vehicle trips generated from dwellings east of the Princess of Wales hospital, an increase of 3% total number of trips compared to the 2031 Reference Case and a 5% reduction in the average network speed. The diagrams on the slide indicated that traffic problems occurred at similar locations to the Reference Case and the delay on Broad Street was due to the blocking effect from the Station Road/A142 Angel Drove roundabout.
- Central Growth Scenario - AM Peak Hour resulted in a further 1,200 vehicle trips generated to/from dwellings on the northern expansion site, an increase of 9% total number of trips compared to the 2031 Reference Case and a 18% reduction in the average network speed.
- Trend Growth Scenario - AM Peak Hour resulted in a further 2,100 vehicle trips to/from dwellings on the northern expansion site, an increase of 16% total number of trips compared to the 2031 Reference Case and a 24% reduction in the average network speed.
- LDF Growth Scenario - PM Peak Hour resulted in a further 390 vehicle trips generated from dwellings east of the Princess of Wales hospital

and an increase of 3% total number of trips compared to the 2031 Reference Case.

- Central Growth Scenario - PM Peak Hour resulted in a further 1,550 vehicle trips generated to/from dwellings on the northern expansion site, an increase in 13% total number of trips compared to the 2031 Reference Case and a 19% reduction in the average network speed.
- Trend Growth Scenario - PM Peak Hour resulted in a further 2,660 vehicle trips to/from dwellings on the northern expansion site, an increase of 22% total number of trips compared to the 2031 Reference Case and a 17% reduction in the average network speed.
- It was recognised that improvements to junctions on the A10 would be required in any growth scenario and to ensure that Lynn Road was able to cope with the travel demand that growth would bring.

Ely Southern Bypass

- It was emphasised that although the Route B alignment was used to test the impact of the Southern Bypass, no decision had been made regarding the routing of the bypass.
- It was concluded that an Ely Southern Bypass would provide an attractive alternative to the current level crossing route along the A142. However it was suggested that consideration be given as to whether widening the A10 northbound approach to the aroundabout would be required..

Transport Measures

- Whilst an initial series of potential transport measures aimed at mitigating the increased congestion had been tested, these were only draft proposals and work was yet to commence on other alternatives, feasibility, costings etc.
- The Trend Growth Scenario with and without the Ely Southern Bypass - AM Peak Hour, resulted in traffic re-routing from the A10 to Queen Adelaide Way; delays within Ely were reduced at key junctions along the Lynn Road corridor, an increase in traffic through the Prickwillow Road/Queen Adelaide Way junction and consequently an increase in delay there.
- 2031 Package Combination 1 – AM Peak Hour resulted in a 48% reduction in the overall queue time on the network and 31% increase in average speed compared to the Trend Growth Scenario. The closure of the High Street, Market Street and High Barns to through traffic resulted in trips re-routing onto Prickwillow Road and Lisle Lane, although had no significant impact on delays at junctions with those roads.
- 2031 Package Combination 2 – AM Peak Hour resulted in a 48% reduction in the overall queue time on the network and 30% increase in average speed compared to the Trend Growth Scenario. The improvements to the Queen Adelaide Way junctions eliminated delay at Queen Adelaide Way junction with Prickwillow Road and resulted

in traffic from the north of Ely using the eastern route and relieving the A10.

- 2031 Trend Growth Scenario with the Ely Southern Bypass – PM Peak Hour – The differences with or without the Ely Southern Bypass were subtle. The Ely Southern Bypass resulted in a 5% decrease in overall queue time and 3% increase in average speed. The increase in traffic through Prickwillow Road/Queen Adelaide Way junction resulted in increased delay northbound on Queen Adelaide Way.
- 2031 Package Combination 1 – PM Peak Hour resulted in a 10% reduction in the overall queue time on the network and 5% increase in average speed compared to the Trend Growth Scenario. Delays on the A142 Witchford Road and on the A10 southbound were reduced in the PM peak.
- 2031 Package Combination 2 – PM Peak Hour resulted in a 19% reduction in the overall queue time on the network and 8% increase in average speed compared to the Trend Growth Scenario.

Further to the presentation, the Working Party asked the following questions:

- Cllr Hunt suggested that the peak times were 7am – 8am and not 8am – 9am. Ms Cannon explained that the traffic data that ATKINS collected was over a timeframe from 7am – 7pm. The data had been analysed to assess where the peaks in traffic movement were. Therefore the model peak AM time had been based on 8am – 9am. Cllr Hunt stated that traffic movement on the A10 was higher between 7am – 8am. Mr Addyman explained that following the assessment of the data collected by ATKINS regarding traffic flow; overall the traffic in Ely was the busier during 8am - 9am.
- Following a further question from Cllr Hunt regarding pedestrianisation, Ms Cannon explained that closure of both the High Street and Market Street was tested to assess the impact of mitigating congestion.
- Cllr Friend-Smith enquired if the increase in vehicle trips accounted for new primary and secondary schools as school traffic accounted for much of the congestion at peak times. Cllr Friend-Smith also enquired if alternative solutions other than an Ely Southern Bypass had been considered. Ms Cannon explained that the models tested included developments that had planning approval and were already outlined within the Core Strategy. Rather than considering alternative design solutions for the Ely Southern Bypass, the modelling work had considered the route alignment. Cllr Friend-Smith stated that if there was to be growth then it was important to incorporate schools, rather than just houses. The additional traffic generated by schools was also necessary to consider.
- Cllr Ashton noted that the Transport Modelling Study had highlighted that irrespective of what happened in the future there would be an increase in the traffic generated. Ms Cannon referred to the presentation that 2800 additional trips would be generated by the developments included in the Reference Case. An increase of 39% in the total number of trips compared to the Base Year.

- Cllr Wilson stated that the Base Year Model Network stopped north of Stretham and that the traffic from Stretham down to Waterbeach and Cambridge had to be considered. Cllr Wilson noted that one of the reasons that Mereham was refused was due to the traffic that it would generate on the A10. Mr Smith, Transport Strategy Manager, Cambridgeshire County Council, explained that the traffic model would include the junction of the A10 junction at Stretham with the A1123 and noted that the new railway station at Chesterton had to be factored into assisting with the alleviation of future traffic generation.
- Following a question from Cllr Allen regarding the Reference Case, the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that it considered the current situation and any developments that had an extant planning permission. It did not consider developments that were highlighted in the LDF without planning permissions.
- Cllr Allen believed that if the Ely Southern Bypass were built it would actually generate additional traffic, rather than divert traffic, as the bypass would be an attractive route, particularly for heavy goods vehicles if there were delays on the A14. This would then impact on the A142 and other local roads. Ms Cannon explained that the Transport Modelling Study had considered the effect that the bypass would have on Ely. If further consideration were to be given to the bypass then there was still work required regarding investigating this and other options. Mr Smith further added that the Highways Agency had stated that it did not believe that the Ely Southern Bypass would have a material affect on the A14 as the bypass would not be an attractive alternative route. Although whether or not some would find it an attractive alternative would depend on where traffic was travelling to/from. When considering the bypass it would be necessary to refer to data from the East of England Regional Model.
- Cllr Petts stated that it was very negative to be referring to Mereham when considering developments within the Masterplan and Local Development Framework, as there were very major differences.
- Cllr Wilson hoped that the Transport Modelling Study had taken account of the extra traffic that would be generated from the expansion of Lancaster Way Business Park, the new recycling centre and the additional traffic generated from further employment sites encouraged to the district. Ms Cannon explained that to establish trip generation figures, data from similar industrial areas as well as from further afield were considered. Projected growth was also taken account of.
- Cllr Cornell echoed concerns that the bypass could create a rat run from the A14.
- Cllr Allen suggested that the two main objectives for the Masterplan would be to tackle congestion and climate change and wondered whether such suggested growth would be able to achieve those objectives. Cllr Allen also enquired if the projected figure of 39% increase in the total number of trips could be reduced. Ms Cannon explained that transport measures were required to support growth. Sustainable modes of transport assisted with the alleviation of congestion. The 39% increase was based on the Reference Case and the other growth scenarios produced similar figures. However with

more time other modelling work could be undertaken to try to reduce the projected increase to below 39%.

- Cllr Ashton highlighted that if further employment opportunities were provided within the district, the length of the journey people undertook to travel to work would reduce as would the out commuting which would have a positive effect on climate change and congestion.
- Cllr Goodge stated that the Ely Southern Bypass would encourage a free flow of traffic movement that would result in lower carbon emissions and would therefore benefit Ely.
- Cllr Hunt agreed that heavy goods vehicles, especially those working under a contract, could be attracted to using the bypass if it was the shortest route.
- Cllr Rouse emphasised that it was important that Ely railway station was improved so that it encouraged more people to use rail as a mode of transport. The growth should be lead by the quality of life that people desired. Cllr Rouse preferred to the Central Growth Scenario of 3,000 dwellings, which if designed well could attract people to the area.
- Cllr Allen referred minute no. 84 of the notes of the previous Working Party meeting, as included in the agenda. Cllr Allen had asked whether the Transport Study could be made available well before the next Working Party meeting. The Executive Director had agreed that the Study document could be sent out in good time. However, Cllr Allen was very disappointed that this work had been distributed as a item 'to follow', less than a week before the meeting. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that there had been a considerable amount of work undertaken regarding the Transport Study, which was not yet complete. It was felt that the Working Party should be presented with the information that was available to date, as soon as it was ready.

The third and fourth presentations that the Working Party received were from the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development. A supplementary paper titled 'Implications for Masterplan and Development Framework Proposals' was tabled at the meeting to support those presentations. In addition to the presentation, the Head of Planning and Sustainable Development Principal elaborated that:

- The estimated population currently in Ely was 18,000.
- The presentation included various slides with maps illustrating the land required for 500 dwellings, 1000 dwellings, 3000 dwellings and 5000 dwellings as well as number of houses per hectare. The maps also included land required for employment etc, not just homes.
- The employment self-sufficiency for Ely was lower than other comparable areas.
- It was noted that there was still some work required relating to the 'Ely on the Move – Local' map, which illustrated one of the Development Framework Proposals.
- There were already links between Market Street and the High Street in Ely. However, there was the potential for further linkages and

development, it would need to be sensitively designed to complement the environment.

Further to the presentation, the Working Party asked the following questions:

- Cllr Wilson noted that the estimated population figures for the various growth scenarios ranged from 18,000 – the current population – through to 30,000. Without any growth there would be an increase of 39% in the total number of trips undertaken. Therefore the greater the growth the more traffic would be generated. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development highlighted that the 39% already included developments that had extant planning permissions but had not yet been built.
- Cllr Ashton explained that the concept of the Masterplan process was to ensure future growth was sustainable and that the district was self-reliant. Currently the disposable income of people within the district was mainly being spent outside of the district and this needed to be addressed. Future growth needed to be delivered via a range of densities as well as balanced accommodation provision.
- Cllr Friend-Smith felt that the same concerns were being raised as had previously been expressed prior to the consultation exercises and that it was important for the public to support the Plan.
- Cllr Rouse suggested that access was a major element of the Plan and that public bus routes should incorporate the new leisure village. Although it was desirable for the Paradise Playing Field to be retained there was an opportunity for the surrounding buildings to be developed. There was also work to be undertaken to remove vehicles from the city centre.
- Cllr Allen commended the idea of improving and developing linkages throughout the city centre. Cllr Allen referred to paragraph 6.3 of the officer's report regarding a multi storey car park and stated that a public transport system would not be successful if a multi storey car park was built.
- Cllr Allen referred to the 'Ely at Work' Development Framework Proposals and enquired whether it was proposed to develop employment sites on the site where Tesco was currently located and to relocate Tesco to Cam Drive. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that the proposed new employment sites illustrated on the 'Ely at Work' Development Framework Proposals did not refer to Tesco. However this could be a development opportunity and that a number of new local centres were proposed to the north of Ely.
- Cllr Allen further referred to the 'Ely at Play' Development Framework Proposal and expressed concern as to whether the potential opportunity site for retail located at Angel Drove was really the best location. Cllr Allen was also of the opinion that it would be detrimental to build a new leisure village on the far side of the bypass. The proposed location of the new leisure village would reduce footfall within the city centre, create traffic issues, including for

the surrounding villages, and there would also be issues with crossing the bypass to access the leisure village. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development explained that consideration was required regarding the types of retail related to bulky goods that should be located within the city centre and where it should be located. There were also issues that required negotiations related to the proposed new leisure village.

9. **ELY MASTERPLAN TIMETABLE**

The Working Party was presented with the current timetable for the Ely Masterplan production.

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer highlighted that the next Working Party meeting would need to be arranged during the week commencing 27 July 2009, followed by a Special Meeting of the Strategic Development Committee, which would need to be organised during August. It was then intended that any final amendments to the Plan and the printing of the Plan would be undertaken during September with the formal public consultation of the Masterplan commencing on 28 September through to 9 November. The Strategic Development Committee would be presented with the Masterplan for recommendation to Council on 19 January 2010.

The Principal Sustainable Development Officer was very aware that the Working Party had been presented with a considerable amount of information at the meeting and encouraged Members to contact officers with any queries.

Cllr Hunt informed the Working Party that he had spent the majority of May knocking on electorates doors during the election campaign and the consensus of the electorate was concerned and against development to the north of Ely. Due to this reaction Cllr Hunt did not believe that the public had been fully involved or educated about the Masterplan. Further work was required to consult with the public, to explain the concept and objectives of the Masterplan. It was obvious to Cllr Hunt that the electorate did care and wanted to be involved in the process. The Masterplan was probably the biggest matter for Ely to consider for a number of years, the results of which would remain forever. Cllr Hunt therefore suggested that a referendum be timetabled into the work programme between the meetings of Strategic Development Committee and Council.

Cllr Rouse enquired if there was a referendum what question would be asked. Cllr Hunt stated that the question posed at the referendum should ask whether the electorate wanted the Masterplan and growth or not. The Chairman stated that irrespective of whether Ely had a Masterplan growth would occur.

Cllr Hunt stated that the consultation, such as the event that had taken place in The Lamb Hotel, had not been sufficient. The electorate should have six to twelve months to consider the proposals of the Masterplan before it was

adopted by Council. If a positive campaign of the Masterplan was conducted then Cllr Hunt believed that the electorate would welcome the Masterplan.

The Chairman emphasised that the concept of the Masterplan was to plan for growth, growth that was inevitable. The alternative was that Ely would experience unplanned growth. Cllr Hunt again reiterated that the Masterplan was such a big issue that the electorate should be consulted as to whether or not they want the Masterplan. If the arguments, as explained by the Chairman were also explained sufficiently to the electorate then the Masterplan might be supported.

Cllr Allen accepted that there might well be future growth. However, the Masterplan was in anticipation of the Regional Spatial Strategy housing growth figures. Cllr Allen believed that the minimum amount of growth was what should be considered. The public must be informed during the consultation of all the positive and negatives points regarding the Masterplan as people appreciated being told the true facts. Cllr Allen noted that the timetable stated that the Strategic Development Committee meeting on 16 June 2009 would be making a policy decision on transport issues and growth, yet the Transport Modelling Study work was incomplete. The Head of Planning and Sustainable Development confirmed that this was incorrect and that the Strategic Development Committee on 16 June 2009 would not be making a policy decision on transport issues and growth.

Cllr Friend-Smith agreed that the public should be offered options but did not agree that a referendum was the best solution. Cllr Friend-Smith suggested that the timetable be revised to allow for the process to be delayed as arranging a meeting in August was not ideal as this was a month when traditionally many Members and the public took a vacation.

10. **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

At the invitation of the Chairman, members of the public were invited to make any final comments on the discussion of the meeting and the following point was made:

- Consideration should be given to the proposed introduction dates relating to the Strategic Growth Options, as presented on the maps displayed at the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 9.57pm.